P. Fr. 12 of 96

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1895-96

192 .

(L. R.)

Later references.

File No. 117 of 95

Serial Nos. 1 to 8

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 8

M ~~Part~~ B for November 1896.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Veraffaich and others regarding the Shanbhoga of Hadinaru, Nanjangud Taluk.

WD 2233—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Indexed

(3)

Appeal No 138 of 1895-96.

Appellants.

1. Virapayathiramma
2. Chennappayya
3. Lingannayya
4. Nanjundayya
5. Srikantayya
Minors by guardian the 1st Appellant.

Respondent.

Virabhadrayya.

Appeal No 16 of 1895-96.

Appellant.

Virabhadrayya

Respondents.

Virapayya & others

Appeals against the Privy Council's judgment regarding the Shanbhogi of Hadinaru in the Nanjangud Taluk

List of papers in English

(1) Acting Commr's judgment
(2) Dy. Commr's do
(3) Appeal Petition of Virapayya & others
(4) do Virabhadrayya
(5) Offl Memorandum
(6) Dy Commr's docket.

The Deputy Com^r has somewhat complicated the case by decreeing a relief which was not asked. ~~and [illegible]~~ The Pltff's ~~asked for a joint~~ prayer was ~~[illegible]~~ for being declared as the [illegible] heir - Both the lower Courts have found that the 1st Dfdt & his father & grandfather have been the registered Shantopai and that he acted as the sole Shantopai from 1853 - It is unnecessary to do more than adjudicate the claim advanced by the Pltff and as he failed to establish it the suit was properly dismissed by the Agdt Court. The Dy Commr's modified decree is reversed & that of the Agdt Court restored

23-7-96

Applied
AC 4/8.

L.R. 117-95-1

3

(1)

1896 (3)

Stamp Sufficient

In time

Council case

Sub. Sd. Sd

Hi 21/3/96

Councillor

24-3-96

Call for report from the usual course

10/4/96

11-4-96

Defl.

13/4

No. 3265

Name of Petitioner, Kuppu Pillai for Mrs Rajamma

Village, Kadiapatti

Taluk, Manjanaikkadi

District, Tanjore

Date of Arzi,

Date of Receipt, 21-3-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 3

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the decision of the Dy. Comr. Tanjore District in Ref. Appeal No. 4 of 1895 of 17-2-96 refusing the office of Shanbog of Kadiapatti, Manjanaikkadi Taluk

The 1st appellant and the 1st respondent English.

NK

21/3

P Pet 1860 / C.R. 35 of 1895-96

4 Ex 4 (2) 32 20-03-96 16-4-96

L R 117-95-2

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition.

No. 3265 ~~dated~~

received at the Dewan's Office ~~from~~ on 21-3-96 from Venkappa and 4 others of Hadinahalu in the Ranjangudu Taluk, appealing against the decision of the Deputy Commr of Mysore in Revenue Appeal No. 4 of 1895-96 on the file of his court, regarding the Shanbhogi of Hadinahalu

is forwarded, together with its three enclosures, to the Deputy Commissioner of the Mysore District for submission of the entire proceedings connected with the case, ~~together with a full report of the facts of the case, and on the points urged in the petition.~~

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

By order,

Draft- C.

13/4/96

~~Chief~~ Secretary.

BANGALORE,

13-4-1896 / 16.

A.S. 13/4

S.C. 13/4

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

Gen. 31 (3)

189

(6)

REVENUE DEPARTMENT
Dt. 8058
Ref. No. 687
APR. 96
REVENUE OFFICE

From The Dy Commissioner of the Mysore District

To The Secretary to the Govt of Mysore
Rev: & Genl: Deptts

Dated 23rd April 1896.

Despatched

Received

General No. 1306
No.

Enclosure No. 2 files & 18 pm with 3 Maps

× in a separate packet

Forwards the entire record in re the Shaubhogi of Hadinaru village in the Nanjangud Taluk.

Put up
27-4-96

Notes
Seen all the records are complete
Note Tas the last paragraph
Noted for hearing along with the
date to March 1894 Notes

No 1306

Deputy Commissioners Office
Mysore District

Dated Mysore 25th April 1896.

To,

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
Revenue and General Deptts.

Sir,

As required in your official memorandum No $\frac{Pet}{500}$ dated the 13th April 1896, I have the honor to submit herewith the entire record in re the petition of Veerapaiah and 4 others of Hadinaru, regarding the Shanbhogi of the Hadinaru village in the Nanjangud Taluk.—

2. The petition with its enclosures is herewith retransmitted.—

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedt. Servant,

[signature]

Dy Commissioner,
Mysore District.

MM

MYSORE COURT FEE

3265

A.S. 21/3

Settd. 21-3-96

A.S. 131 of 95-96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 3265
DATE 21-3-96

ಪ್ರ-ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 3
8-9-96

To The Government of Mysore.

Mano Appellants

3/96.

C. Appellants / Respondents } 1. Venkataiah Shetty.
2. Chinnappa, son of —do—
3. Lingamma —do— —do
4. Nanjamma —do— —do
5. Seenuta —do— —do
Minor represented by Appellant all residing in the Village of Hadinadu, Kunigal Taluq.

Page 1/2

Respondent / Plaintiff } Venkatappa, son of Chinnappa residing at Hadinadu Village, Kunigal Taluq.

Appellants against the decree of the Court of Mysore Judge in appeal No. 131 of 95-96 dated 1/3/96.



[illegible]

20.3.96

[illegible]

February 1896. on the following among other grounds viz:—

I. That the Lower Court erred in not considering the question of limitation as between appellants and the respondent raised in the case.—

II. That the Lower Court having substantially upheld the contention of the appellants, that the respondent's claim not being officiated, assumed in their own right the present plaintiff (respondent) cannot claim it officiate, the reason that he is a stranger at the distance of time viz 21 years is likely to lead to future litigation & complication

III. That the grounds of appeal set forth in the judgment of the Lower Court have been satisfactorily established by the public document produced in the case.—

S. R. 117-95-4

1896 (4)

No. 3704

Name of Petitioner, Veeralingappa

Village, Hadinane

Taluk, Nanjungud Sh

District, Mysore Dt

Date of Arzi, 14-5-96

Date of Receipt, 16-5-96

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, (2) ~~[illegible]~~ Two.

ABSTRACT.

Appeal against the decision of the Mysore Deputy Comr in regular Rev. Appeal No. 4 of 1896 regarding the office of the Shanbhagi of Hadinane in the Nanjungud Taluk.

The petition and the Deputy Comr's judgment are in English

Stamped 10 Rs

16/5/96

[illegible] khan
[illegible] up refers

[illegible]

[illegible]
[illegible] up refers (vide asst [illegible] of 23-5-96)

1890-1891 [illegible] 92-93 [illegible]

11 6 96

Stamp sufficient
Time
Council Case
This is a cross appeal.
The appeal of the other party has been admitted & fixed 6th July 1896 as per order.
[illegible]
1895-96

12/6/96

[illegible] be heard on the same date. Amendments [illegible]
13/6/96

IV. The lower Court erred in not granting the consequential relief prayed for by Plaintiff (Respondent) in addition to the decree of the Plaintiff's suit, and the order passed by the Court that appellants should pay the Plaintiff's costs of the suit was therefore wrong.

+ Page 2

V. The Lower Court erred in not finding the public accounts admitted by the appellants (defendants) and the decision of the Lower Court is opposed to law, facts & probabilities.

For the above reasons appellants pray that the judgment and decree complained of be reversed with costs, and the judgment of the original Court restored.

[illegible]

U. (4)

MYSORE COURT FEE

3704
8-9-96

To,

The Dewan in Council of the Government of Mysore.

Revenue appeal No. of 1895-96.

Appellant.
Veerabhadrappa (Plaintiff)

Respondents (Defts.)
1. Veerappa.
2. Channappa.
3. Lingappa.
4. Ramaiah.
5. Sreekantaiah all residing in Hadinaru in the Rajanagar Taluq.

A.S. 167 of 1895-96

The appellant above named most respectfully begs to appeal from the decision of the Deputy Commissioner of Mysore in regular Revenue appeal No. 3 of 1895 for the following reasons.

1. The Deputy Commissioner having declared the appellant to be a Sharer in the Shanabhogi office Hadinaru ought to have granted the appellant's prayer either to work with the present Baramadar jointly or to order a suitable division of the Shanabhogi Charge.

2. The Deputy Commissioner has erred in supposing that the appellant's prayer was for the exclusive possession of the Shanabhogi from the respondents.

3. The evidence on record clearly proves that in former times the Shanabhogi had been worked after both by the ancestors of the appellant and the respondents.

4. The Village being measured and the Jamabandi being more than (4,000) Rs. and owing to the existence of the Chandra Channel and the proposed Survey settlement, the Shanabhogi office in question is exactly the one which might conveniently divided.

5. From the conduct of the respondents hands at first the

13-5-96

Kyajalungahmed-

the denial of plaintiff's relationship and then the shifting of the defence that the office of Shanbhog was denied to him the father in law of the respondents' grandfather, it is plain that the respondents inflicted all sorts of restrictions in the way of the appellant enjoying his just rights of which he has been deprived till now by the fact of his minority at the time of his father's death. — O.B.S.C.J.

Dated 14th May 1896

Appellant (Plff) Hirailingiya

Respondent (Defts) Hirayiyanna and others.

Dept. not for offered

13

Proceedings of the Govt of Bigoore.

Read:-

(1) Petition of appeal No. 326/138 of 1895-96, presented by Hirailingiya and his son of Hariyana Rayappa-gud Shah, against the decree of the Deputy Commr of Bigoore in Revenue appeal No. 4 of 1896, regarding the Shanbhogi of Bhanbhar-kan and 16 Dakhale villages.

(2) Petition of appeal No. 3704/167 of 1895-96 presented by Hirailingiya of Hariyana against the same decree.

(3) Records received with letter No. 308 dated 23rd April 1896 from the Deputy Commr, Bigoore District.

Facts of the case

Hirayiyanna, the grandfather of the 1st defendant, was the Bhanbhar-kar Shanbhog the village. On his death he was succeeded by his

his son Chamapfiya (4th Defts adoptive father). The latter was registered as Barmadar in March, 1842 and on his death in June 1853, his son the 5th Defdt, was registered as Chandhag. The 5th Defdt being then a minor then, the Plaintiffs father as Chamapfiaya, who was a Hisedar, was authorized to act as guardian, and on his death in 1857, the 5th Defdt, who was found to be competent, was permitted to entry upon the duties of the office. In 1893 the Plaintiff instituted a suit (1) for the establishment of his right as a Hisedar and (2) for either joint possession of the office with 5th Defdt or for possession of such share of the duties as the Govt might be pleased to allot to him. Pleaded that his great grandfather Kalingaya was the son of Chamapfiaya Phaiya the adoptive father of Virapfiaya, 5th Defts grandfather, and

~~Bent~~ The 1st Defdt urged that the
said Kindingiya was not the son
but a nephew of his great grand-
father Eriamphiawa. The
Dist Appellate Commr who tried the
suit held that the Plaintiff
had no right to a share in the
office or to joint possession of it
and dismissed the suit with costs.
On appeal the Defdts Commr
modified that decree to the extent
of declaring the Plaintiff to be a
hereditary and directed that Defdts
should bear the Plaintiffs costs
throughout. Both parties have
appealed ~~against~~ from the decree.

Decision of Government.

(The Deputy Commr has
somewhat complicated the case
by decreeing a relief which
the material relief
was not asked for in the plaint.
The Plaintiff
prayed

Subd
The Plaint does not pray for
a declaration that he has a hereditary
right to the office. Court
has power to grant such relief
as the consequential relief claimed, but the Deputy
granted the declaration. It is to be noted that
this relief was not asked for, or may

(8) (9) Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

Read: 7

(1) Petition of appeal No $\frac{3263}{138}$ of 1895-96 presented by Virappaiya and his sons of Hadinaru Nanjangud Taluk, against the decree of the Deputy Commr of Mysore in Revenue appeal No 4 of 1896, regarding the Shanbhogi of Hadinaru and its Dakhale villages

(2) Petition of Appeal No $\frac{3704}{167}$ of 1895-96 presented by Viralingaiya of Hadinaru, against the same decree.

(3) Records received with letter No 1306 dated 23d April 1896 from the Deputy Commr Mysore District

Appellant Plff)	Respondents (Defts)
Lingaiya	Virappaiya and Ors

Facts of the case

Virappaiya, the grandfather of the 1st Defendant was the Baravardar Shanbhogi of the village. On his death he was succeeded by his son Chennappa (1st Defendant's adoptive father). The latter was registered as Baravardar in March 1842 and on his

death in June 1853, his son, the 1st Deft. was registered as Shanbhog. The 1st defendant having been a minor then, the Plaintiff's father Chennappaiya, who was a hissadar, was authorized to act as gumasta, and on his death in 1871, the 1st Deft. who was found to be competent, was permitted to enter upon the duties of the Office

2. In 1893, the Plaintiff instituted a suit (1) for the establishment of his right as a Hissedar and (ii) for either joint possession of the office with 1st Deft. or for possession of such share of the duties as the Govt. might be pleased to allot to him. He alleged that his great grandfather Viralingaiya was the son of Chennappaiya the adoptive father of Virappaiya, 1st Deft's grandfather; but the 1st Deft. urged that the said Viralingaiya was not the son, but a nephew of his great grandfather Chennappaiya

not
prayer was for being declared to be the people
holden simply
for which the alleged no cause
~~possession~~ Both the lower
Courts have found that the 1st
Defendant and his father and
grandfather have been the
registered Shanbhog and
that the Plaintiff's ancestors
from 1833 (It is unnecessary to do
more than adjudicate the claim
advanced by the Plaintiff, and
the right ~~[illegible]~~ discharge
he failed to establish it) the suit
was properly dismissed by the
Assistant Commissioner.
The Deputy Commr's ~~[illegible]~~ modified
which ~~[illegible]~~ but ~~the~~ declaration
decree is reversed and that of
the Assistant Commissioner
is restored

may be [illegible]
of action whatever.
The averment in the
plaint is that he
asked the Dy Commr for
the village accounts
and for permission
to do the duties of
[illegible]

(Shanbhogue) and
that the Dy Commr denied
his prayer and refused
to allow him to do
the work. The refusal was
~~[illegible]~~ denial was
of the prayer to do the
work either jointly
or exclusively
and this was the
refusal by the
first Court.

Secretary

To
The Deputy Commr
Mysore District with
Record & copy of Ord.
granted to the parties.

19

L.R. 117-95-5

The Ag. Asst. Commissioner who tried the suit held that the Plaintiff had no right to a share in the Office or to joint possession of it and dismissed the suit with costs. On appeal, the Adg. Commr. modified that decree to the extent of declaring the Plaintiff to be a hereditary and directed that Defts should bear the Plaintiff's costs throughout. Both parties have appealed from this decree.

No. 2645 / P.712-96.
Ent: 19 Ver: filed
Dt. 4/9-9-96.

Decision of Govt.

Both the Lower Courts have found that the 1st Defendant, his father and grandfather have been the Baramahal Shanbhogs, and that the 1st defendant was a registered Shanbhog since 1853, actually performing the work since 1871.

2 The suit was rightly dismissed by the Asst. Commr. The declaration by the Deputy Commr. that the Plaintiff was a hereditary

was unnecessary under the circumstances of the case.

3. Govt therefore reverse the Dy. Commrs decree so far as it relates to his declaration and affirm that of the Court of the 1st instance

Redraft
C 203

C. U. 9 96

Secretary

To The Deputy Commr
Mysore District, with records and
copy of endorsement granted
to the parties.

SV.

[illegible]
9/9.

L. R. 117-956

21 (10) ౨౦-రోజులు 8-9-96

నంబరు 3265 సం 3
3704 సం 2 135
161 ప్రకటించిన తేదీ

యుంద

సంఖ్యనమూనాలు తాలూకు
పదినాలు (గా) మువల్లాలువమీ
రుప్పయ్యి స్త్రీలకి మరుమ్మ
దలంగలుగ గెజిటీలో నోటిఫికేషను
లు.

మీలాకిండపదినారు (గా)
మువకాగుస్త్రీలకి కవిషాం
దల్లామ్మనూరు జిల్లా లో
ప్రతికమిషనరు ఆఫ్ రుసర్
1890 వెగ్గ సవి 4 నెల సంబంధితివిధ్య
ఆప్పిలోమాఖద్దిమీయల్లా
కోల్పోకుండిన మీలాకి
ఇవయు వాదిగళు నాల్గాగిరు
ఖరాయిసికోండ ఆప్పిలు
లో ఆఖరిగ్యాన్నా ఆప్పుగ్యా
గిసంబంధపత్రవిరోధికా
డదినూ పరాంబరిసలా
యుతు

1 ప్రతివాది విరోధ్య
ఆవనత్రంవీరాత సుకోబిరా
వదిరివారికానుగ్రాగికా
గిద్దరింతలూ, సవరినవతరి

L.R. 117-95-7

(11) 1896

No 1143.

Name of Petr. – Veeralingiah son of Chennappiah

Village – Hadinur.

Taluk – Nanjangud.

District – Mysore.

Date of Petn – 2-10-96

Date of Receipt – 3-10-96

No. of Encl. – 1.

Abstract.

Petr. + Applicant	Respondent Counter petitioner
Veeralingiah son of Chennappiah residing at Hadinur, Nanjangud Taluq	1. Veerappiah son of Chennappiah 2. Chennappiah son of (1) 3. Linganna brother of (2) (4) Manjunadiah brother of (3) (5) Sreekantaiah brother of (4)

Petr. begs that the Govt. Endt. No. 3704/167 of 8th Sept. (submitted with petition) may be reconsidered on the following grounds.

(1) The petitioner petitioned to the 1st Gl: Asstt Commr Mysore in 93-94 (Rev: no 1) to establish his joint claim ~~over~~ the ~~joint patta of~~ Shambogi of the village of Hadinur and ~~[illegible]~~ its dathbandi

[illegible] was [illegible] no. 632 of [illegible]

[illegible] inst. appears to have [illegible] on 30/9/96

I received the P.T. 12 of 96 put up no. 632 for note on the 5th October [illegible] was acknowledged by Mr Vijayan on the same date.

[illegible]

Submitted

This is an application for review of the decision passed in Govt: Pro: No: 2645 of 4/9 sept 96.

(1) stamp sufficient

(2) Application in time.

(3) Endt. given by the Govt. in pro 2645

7/11/96

No reasons to review

11/11/96

Endt. prepd + Subd. 12/11

independently for orders being passed for the discharge of work jointly with the counter petitioners.

(2) On this court dismissing the complaint, the petr. appealed to the Deputy Comr. (Rev. appeal no 4).

(3) ~~[illegible]~~ ~~Although the Revenue authorities have no jurisdiction over this case as the grounds that (i)~~ The suit was for the confirmation of the joint claim to the office of Shanbog ~~and~~ (ii) the barawards produced by complainant (appellant) and defendants shew that appellant's father & ancestors are hissedars of this office, (iii) the appellant and defendants are members of the same family - (iv) It is ~~mentioned~~ evident from the receipts, Pattas granted ~~by~~ ~~the Hissedars~~ to the ryots, Jirasal patti, Vasooli Book, ~~Pattas granted to ryots~~, and letters of communication between the appellant and Respondents, that the grandfathers of appellant and 1st Respondents, viz,

రిజిస్ట్రేషన్ నెం/87/జి2 సమీక్ష
లో/జి ప్రతివారి యజమానులకు
~~ఆ~~ ~~ఆ~~ తనుసరి/87/జి2
సమీక్షలు అయితే కేలన
సీలాండ్ మత్స్యకారులు తమ
నివాసం కోసం ఇళ్ళు కట్టుకోవడానికి
తీసుకున్న వారికి- వారి వారి
వేలంలో ~~ఆ~~ సమీక్షలు కోరుకున్న
లో ~~ఆ~~ సిస్టర్స్ కమిషనర్ గారు
రు వసూలు చేస్తున్నారు.
ఈ విధంగా ఇప్పటి వరకు విధ్యుక్త
నగ్నంగా ఉన్న కోరికలు, వారి ఇళ్ళు
పిల్లలకు వారసులు పేర్లు మార్చి
కమిషనర్ వారు ~~ఆ~~ వారి పత్రికలు
లో కేటాయించుట ~~ఆ~~ నవత్రికి
వారికి కార్యాలయం తరుత్వ చేయడం వల్ల
రిందు, ఈ భూములను ~~ఆ~~ వారి పేర్ల
సలన్నవి చేయడం ~~ఆ~~ సిస్టర్స్
కమిషనర్ వారి పేర్ల సలన్న ఖా
యం చేయడం జరుగుతుంది.
~~ఆ~~ ఖాళీ లేదు లాప్లేస్ కన్నవారు
సీమాంధ్రలో.
ఇంకా తేదీ 7 సీమాంధ్ర సిస్టర్స్
సమీక్ష/87/జి2 సమీక్ష చేశారు.

B. O.

8-7-96

Secretary

viz Kapanipatah and Veeraphah respectively discharged the duties of Shanbog jointly. (4) The 1st Respondent declares that the appellant is not a ~~hereditary claimant to the office;~~ Hereditary; out of the two reliefs sought by the appellant, the Rev. authorities have no authority to ~~establish claim over the office and~~ order him to discharge the duties of Shanbog jointly with the Respondents as a Hereditary ~~not~~, the ~~Sol~~ Deputy Comr. ~~thinking the case falls under his jurisdiction~~ decided the case without paying any attention to Ext (J) which is the order no 163 issued by the Ashtagram Taluk Cutchery, Mysore District (4) In reply to his appeal against the order of the Deputy Comr, he got the Ext. no 3704/167

(5) The appellant came

Who does not know much of Court procedure and did not therefore produce all the records (before Govt) which are favorable to his cause. The 1st Respondent having been doing the work since 1871, ~~and~~ ~~therefore~~ the two has been declared to have no claim ~~to it~~ and that there is no reason why he should be allowed to work jointly with the Respondent.

(b) The Petr has thus lost his claim ~~over~~ to the Shambhogi which was discharged by his ancestors and has been put to con-siderable loss. If the Petr had been able to submit all the records favorable to him, this would not have been the case. Since the Petr is unable to attend the Court at present, he begs that a day may be fixed for the hearing of the case and ~~to~~ a relative of both the parties viz Shamanbhatta

27

may be examined on behalf of the petr and on perusal of all the records connected with the case he begs that the Govt may be pleased to pass early and favourable orders. Or he begs that the Govt may grant him permission to bring an advocate who can well argue out the case for him.

Points favourable to the petr:—

(1) The Respondents' father died in 1853. At that time the Ashtagram Taluq Cutchery granted the order marked (Ext 2) ~~that both of them should look after the duty joint~~

A perusal of this order will prove that they were joint workers and they were dividing the

appellant with the consent of the latter's mother -

The petn begs that the Govt may be pleased to reconsider the case and pass favorable orders -

B.R.
5/10/96

Tulab and Murasa equally between them.

(2) The same fact is clearly shewn in the Exts from (A) to (I) and and those from (J) to the End.

(3) ~~The Ext~~ Exts. which the Respondent has produced ~~as being granted to the Glasell lands~~ and proves that the Respondent's ancestors did discharge the duty for themselves for the petr's father ~~and on no~~ but not that the Respondent's father is the sole rightful claimant ~~of~~ ~~for~~ to the ~~place~~ office to the exclusion ~~and that~~ the petr's ancestors ~~has no claim~~ ~~whatever~~

(4) After the death of the appellant's father, in 1871 the Respondent was discharging the duty of Shanbhag as the Executor of the

3/0

COURT FEE ONE RUPEE

COURT FEE ONE RUPEE

ONE RUPEE

1443

17-11-96

Mysore Revenue Office,
Partition Department.
No. 1143
Date 3-10-96

(८) दलाल

मी जैन ३-३१० मुंबई पुरुषोत्तम दास ३-२२०२०४ ——

१ ज्ञान हा जगातील सर्व शास्त्रांचा आधार आहे. मानव ज्ञानाच्या प्रगतीमुळे आज चंद्रावर पोहोचला आहे. ज्ञानाच्या प्रगतीमुळे आज मानव

33

ಕ್ರಮ (I) ರಲ್ಲಿನವು ಕ್ರಮ (J) ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು (J) ಸಂಕೇತದಲ್ಲಿ ಉಲ್ಲೇಖಿಸಿರುವ ಅಂಶಗಳು ಸ್ವೀಕಾರಾರ್ಹವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ . . . . . .

೭ ಅಂತಿಮ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ-ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಕರ್ನಾಟಕ ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯಾದಿಂದ ಅಂತಿಮ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ-ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯಾದಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ-ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯಾದಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಲಿಸಿದಾಗ ಅವುಗಳು ಒಂದೇ ಆಗಿರಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೆಯಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ-ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯಾದಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದು . . . . . .

೪ ಸ್ವೀಕೃತ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ-ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಂತೆ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯಾದಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳು ಒಂದೇ ಆಗಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೆಯಾಗದಿದ್ದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ . . . . . .

ಸ್ವೀಕೃತ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳು ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಿಯಾದಿಂದ ಪಡೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೆಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಸಾಬೀತಾದಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವೀಕೃತ ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಗಳನ್ನು ಸ್ವೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ . . . . . .

ಕ್ರಾ.ಪ್ರ.-೧೦-೯೨ನೆಯದು

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ಕ್ರಾಂಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

L.R. 117-95-8

(12)

20-10-96
17-11-96

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]